

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-5, 7-14 and 16-32 are pending and rejected. Claims 6 and 15 were previously cancelled.

Claims 1-4, 10-13, 19-26 and 27-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Cox et al. (hereinafter “Cox”), (US 5,644,452). Claims 5, 7-9, 14 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cox (US 5,644,452) in view of Cubero Pitel (hereinafter “Cubero Pitel”), (US 6,160,239).

Applicants respectfully submit the cited references do not teach or suggest at least a system for a magnetic head arm assembly wherein the surface of a pin element is directly attached to and physically connected along a surface of a first component and a surface of an arm portion (*e.g.*, as described in claim 1).

Such a feature is neither shown nor suggested by the cited Cox reference. *See e.g.*, cited Figs. 1 and 2. In Figure 1, the cited pin element (18) is not directly attached to either the cited first component (14) or the cited arm component (16); the cited pin element (18) is instead inserted through the guide hole 21 and hole 20, precluding direct attachment and physical connection. Similarly, in Figure 2, the guide hole 46 and hole 44 prevent the direct attachment or physical connection of a pin surface along the surface of a first component or the surface of an arm portion.

The Office Action asserts the pin 18 is directly attached to and along a surface of a first component (flex cable 14) on ground run surface 22 by the solder, and is press fitted into hole 20 of arm portion 16. *See* Office Action dated 6/4/2008, paragraph 3. Applicants disagree for at least reasons described above, and submit the description of Cox supports Applicants’ position

as well.

For example, column 3, lines 32-44 states: “Each solder joint 12 includes a pin 18 inserted into hole 20 in rotary arm 16. Each hole 20 can be drilled into rotary arm 16 at a cost which is cheaper to produce than the tapped holes required to secure flex cable 14 to rotary arm 16 with a screw. Pin 18 is pressed into hole 20 in rotary arm 16. Flex cable 14 includes a guide hole 21 for receiving each pin 18 when flex cable 14 is properly aligned adjacent to rotary arm 16. Hole 21 is preferably larger in area than hole 20 so that pin 18 can easily fit through it. In preferred embodiments, a solder pad is placed around hole 21. After flex cable 14 is placed over pin 18, it can be soldered in place, thus securing flexible cable 14 to rotary arm 16.” This section describes pin 18 is pressed into hole 20, and that hole 21 is larger than hole 20. Therefore, if pin is pressed into hole 20, and hole 21 is larger than hole 20, it stands to reason that pin 18 is not directly attached to and physically connected to alleged first arm portion 14 – as shown in Figure 1 and as argued above. As such, Figure 1 clearly shows that pin 18 is not directly attached to and physically connected to at least the alleged first arm portion 14. Therefore, the current rejection is lacking.

Cubero Pitel fails to make up for the deficiencies of Cox. Cubero Pitel is directed toward a laser soldering procedure applicable to the joining of pins over printed circuit boards. However, it does not describe at least these relevant limitations of claim 1 anywhere.

Since at least these features of independent claims 1, 10, 19 and 27 are missing from the cited references, claims 1, 10, 19 and 27 are not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Claims 2-5, 7-9, 11-14, 16-18, 20-26, and 28-32 are allowable as depending from the allowable base claims 1, 10, 19 and 27. Based on the arguments above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the

Application No.: 10/634,269
Amendment After Final dated: August 4, 2008
Reply to Office Action of June 4, 2008

rejections of claims 1-5, 7-14 and 16-32 is respectfully requested.

It is believed that this Amendment places the application in condition for allowance, and early favorable consideration of this Amendment is earnestly solicited.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees, or credit any overpayments, to
Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON LLP

Dated: August 4, 2008

By: /Sumit Bhattacharya/
Sumit Bhattacharya
(Reg. No. 51,469)

KENYON & KENYON LLP
333 West San Carlos St., Suite 600
San Jose, CA 95110

Telephone: (408) 975-7500
Facsimile: (408) 975-7501